

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of CONSTANCE DIANE  
MCCLURE, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GEORGETTE VOROBETZ,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

April 24, 2008

No. 280006

Macomb Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 2006-000117-NA

---

In the Matter of CHRISTOPHER CHARLES  
VOROBETZ, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GEORGETTE VOROBETZ,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

No. 280026

Macomb Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 2006-000520-NA

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Markey, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent appeals by right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to her two children, Constance and Christopher, pursuant to MCL 710.29(7) (termination pursuant to voluntary release). We affirm. These appeals are being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent argues that the trial court improperly assumed jurisdiction over Constance without conducting a jury trial. We disagree. Respondent, who could not be located, was served

by publication, see MCR 3.920(B)(4)(b), but never appeared at or before the adjudicatory hearing. Instead, Constance's father appeared and entered a no contest plea to the allegations against him. That was sufficient to enable the court to exercise jurisdiction over the child and it was not required to hold a separate adjudicatory hearing for respondent. *In re CR*, 250 Mich App 185, 202-205; 646 NW2d 506 (2002).

Respondent also contends that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts to notify her of the proceedings and that the trial court erred by failing to appoint counsel to represent her until she appeared in the proceedings. We find no merit to these issues. The record discloses that respondent was a parole absconder whose whereabouts were unknown, so the court authorized alternate service by publication, which was completed. "Substituted service is sufficient to confer jurisdiction on the court." *In re SZ*, 262 Mich App 560, 565; 686 NW2d 520 (2004). Further, the court rules require the court to advise a parent of her right to counsel at the parent's first court appearance. MCR 3.915(B)(1)(a). The court is also required to appoint counsel for a parent at any hearing if the parent requests counsel and it appears from the record that she is unable to afford counsel. MCR 3.915(B)(1)(b). In this case, respondent never appeared until proceedings were initiated against Christopher, at which point she was represented by counsel.

Respondent does not raise any claim of error with respect to the proceedings concerning Christopher. Thus, there is nothing for this Court to review and any issue involving Christopher has been abandoned. *People v Van Tubbergen*, 249 Mich App 354, 365; 642 NW2d 368 (2002); *People v Miller*, 238 Mich App 168, 172; 604 NW2d 781 (1999).

We affirm.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Jane E. Markey